



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,460	12/18/2000	George P. Copeland	AUS9000460US1	4070

35617 7590 03/25/2004

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
P.O. BOX 684908  
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER
----------

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/740,460

Applicant(s)

COPELAND ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-5, 9, and 16-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carneal et al. (6,598,048) (hereinafter Carneal).

4. As per claim 1, Carneal discloses a software system supporting distributed web applications (see abstract), comprising:

a parent server page (e.g. col lines 64-67), containing a call to a child server page (e.g. col 1, lines 58-67 and col 2, lines 1-3, an inline object is child page);

a cache (e.g. col 7, lines 63-65), containing code for the parent server page (e.g. col 8, lines 7-10) and child server page (e.g. col 8, lines 7-10, an inline object is child page), wherein the code for the parent server page does not contain all the code for the child server page (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-44); and

a link associated (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-15, link is a reference to an inline object) with the call to the child server page (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-15), and encapsulating (e.g. col 8, lines 7-15, encapsulation is the process of combining elements to create a new entity) information for locating and executing the code for the child server page (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-15).

5. As per claim 2, Carneal discloses the child server page may be executed using the link, without executing the parent server page (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-15, link is a reference to an inline object).

6. As per claim 3, Carneal discloses link further comprises a web page address (e.g. col 1, lines 39-57) and a list of request attributes (e.g. col 8, lines 43-49).

7. As per claim 4, Carneal discloses The software system as recited in claim 1, wherein the cache is associated with a web server (e.g. col 6, lines 16-25).

8. As per claim 5, Carneal discloses an instruction sequence that may be invoked to locate the child server page in the cache (e.g. col 6, lines 35-44).

9. As per claims 9, 17, and 18, Carneal discloses a method for caching a parent and a child sever page (see abstract), comprising:

storing code for the parent sever page in a cache (e.g. col 6, lines -35, homepage is a parent page), such that the code for the parent sever page does not contain all lines of code for the child sever page (e.g. col 6, lines 36-44);

storing only one copy (e.g. col 6, lines 36-44, an inline object is a child page) of the code for the child sever page in the cache (e.g. col 6, lines 36-44);

creating in the code (e.g. col 1, lines 58-67) for the parent sever page a link to the singular copy of the code for the child sever page (e.g. col 1, lines 58-67, link is an external reference and an inline object is a child page) for locating and executing the code for the child sever page (e.g. col 2, lines 24-40); and

associating the link with more than one call to the child sever page (fig 7, e.g. col 8, lines 7-15, link is a reference to an inline object) to execute from the cache a plurality of the singular copy of the code for the child sever page (col 6, lines 14-45).

10. As per claim 16, Carneal discloses a computer product (e.g. col 1, lines 28-38), comprising a web server (fig 6, element 26) and a software system (e.g. fig 6, col 7, lines 54-57), wherein the web server includes a processor (e.g. col 1, lines 28-52), memory (e.g. col 4, lines 1-5), mass storage (e.g. col 6, lines 19-22) and a network interface (e.g. col 5, lines 55-67), and the software system is adapted for caching a parent and a child sever page (e.g. col 8, lines 7-10, an inline object is child page), such that the code for the parent sever page does not contain all lines of code for the child sever page (e.g. col 8, lines 7-10, and col 6, lines 36-44 an inline object is child page).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. Claims 6-8 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carneal et al. (6,598,048) (hereinafter Carneal) in view of Helgeson et al. (6,643,652) (hereinafter Helgeson).

12. As per claim 6, Carneal is silent about the object-oriented software system.

However, Helgeson discloses object-oriented software system (e.g. col 5, lines 13-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

13. As per claims 7 and 10, Carneal is silent about the server page comprises a Java Server Page (JSP).

However, Helgeson discloses the server page comprises a Java Server Page (JSP) (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

14. As per claim 8, Carneal discloses the child (e.g. col 8, lines 7-10, an inline object is child page), in response to a request made to the web server (fig 6) by the client or another web server (e.g. fig 6, col 12, lines 22-29).

Carneal is silent about using JSP (java server pages) technology.

However, Helgeson discloses JSP technology to create web pages (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

15. As per claim 11, Carneal discloses invoking an instruction sequence to locate the code for the child page in the cache (e.g. col 6, lines 35-44), in response to a request made by a web browser (e.g. col 12, lines 22-42).

Carneal is silent about using JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages.

However, Helgeson discloses the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it

would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

16. As per claim 12, Carneal discloses executing the code for the child page using the link, without executing all the code for the parent page (e.g. fig 7, col 8, lines 7-15).

Carneal is silent about using the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages.

However, Helgeson discloses the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

17. As per claim 13, Carneal discloses the child page is executed in the web server in response to a request made by the client (e.g. col 12, lines 22-45) or another web server (e.g. fig 6).

Carneal is silent about the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages.

However, Helgeson discloses the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

18. As per claim 14, Carneal discloses the child page is executed only if it cannot first be located in the cache (e.g. fig 7, col 8, lines 30-60).

Carneal is silent about the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages.

However, Helgeson the JSP (java server pages) technology to create web pages (e.g. col 51, lines 20-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

19. As per claim 15, Carneal fails to disclose the cached child page may be updated without also updating the parent page.

However, Helgeson discloses the cached child page may be updated without also updating the parent page (e.g. col 63, lines 59-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Carneal with Helgeson because it would provide pre-fetching child objects referenced by the parent object in the cache maintained by the proxy or web server, child objects can be sent to the browser without waiting.

### ***Conclusion***

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,282,548 to Burner et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0229529 to Mui et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100